UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/713,600	11/15/2000	Harold Kraft	61000/101	9771

7590 04/08/2005

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Clinton Square
P.O. Box 31051
Rochester, NY 14603

EXAMINER	
LE, MIRANDA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/713,600	KRAFT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Miranda Le	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 November 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 11/16/2004.

2. Claims 1-54 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 25, 49, 51, 53 are independent claims. In the Amendment, claims 1, 13, 19, 25 49, 51, 52, 53 have been amended, no claims have been added, or cancelled. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless:
>
> (e) the invention was described in
>
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or
>
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2, 5-9, 13-14, 17-21, 25-26, 29-33, 37, 39, 41, 43-45, 49-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gao et al. (US Patent No. 6,490,579 B1).

Gao anticipated independent claims 1, 13, 25, 49, 51, 53, by the following:

As to claims 1, 13, 25, Gao teaches a method for retrieving data, comprising: selecting one of a plurality of user input (i.e. Context field 366, Query field 364), stored

electronic records search requests from a queued search database to execute next based upon one or more selection criteria (i.e. Subject Areas, col. 7, lines 17-30, col. 8, line 58 to col. 9, line 18, col. 8, lines 47-57, col. 9, lines 31-59, Figs. 1, 3);

executing the selected electronic records search request and retrieving at least one electronic record from at least one storage location during the executing (col. 8, lines 6-27);

parsing the electronic records to convert one or more raw data sets into user selectable objects (col. 3, lines 20-35, col. 8, lines 6-27, col. 9, line 60 to col. 10, line 7, Fig. 5-step 518);

causing the user-selectable objects to be displayed (col. 9, line 60 to col. 10, line 7, Fig. 5-step 526).

As to claims 49, 51, 53, Gao teaches a method for determining which of a plurality of queued search request to implement, the method comprising: evaluating one or more user input, electronic records search requests using one or more search selection criteria (col. 8, line 46 to col. 9, line 18);

selecting one of the user input, electronic records search requests to execute next based upon the evaluation (col. 8, line 46 to col. 9, line 18);

executing the selected search (col. 8, line 46 to col. 9, line 18, col. 9, line 60 to col. 10, line 7).

As to claims 2, 14, 26, Gao teaches selecting at least one of the user-selectable objects to retrieve the raw data set associated with the selected object (Fig. 5-step 526).

As to claims 5, 17, 29, Gao teaches the parsing further comprises extracting the at least one raw data set (i.e. Data extraction pattern) from the retrieved electronic records (col. 9, line 60 to col. 10, line 7, Fig. 5-step 524).

As to claims 6, 18, 30, Gao teaches the parsing is implemented by at least one data processing algorithm based substantially on an artificial intelligence (i.e. where, what and how the information is gathered, col. 7, lines 1-30, col. 5, lines 55-67).

As to claims 7, 19, 31, Gao teaches determining at least one data parsing algorithm that should be used for parsing the retrieved records based upon a content of the retrieved electronic records (i.e. Pattern to extract information, col. 3, lines 20-35, col. 7, lines 1-30);

executing the parsing using the at least one determined data parsing algorithm (col. 7, lines 1-30).

As to claims 8, 20, 32, Gao teaches the parsing further comprises filtering (i.e. Subject Areas, Information Type, Problem Type, col. 7, lines 1-30, Fig. 1), sorting (Ranking 170, Fig. 1) or analyzing the retrieved electronic records for data consistency (col. 3, lines 20-35, col. 7, lines 1-30).

As to claims 9, 21, 33, Gao teaches determining if at least one of a plurality of electronic records databases associated with each electronic records search request is accessible through a first or a second communication medium (col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 54, Fig. 1);

accessing the at least one electronic records database through the first or the second communication medium based on the determination (i.e. information sources may include various web site and proprietary databases, col. 5, lines 38-39, Fig. 1).

As to claims 37, 39, 41, Gao teaches the selecting one of the plurality of electronic records search requests to execute next based upon the one or more selection criteria further comprises examining search data associated with each of the electronic records search requests and evaluating the search data using the one or more selection criteria (col. 6, lines 32-53, col. 7, lines 19-63, col. 5, lines 29-44, col. 6, lines 11-63).

As to claims 43, 44, 45, Gao teaches one or more of the stored search requests are stored (i.e. batch processing) in a search database when the search request cannot be executed at the time the search request is made (col. 9, lines 31-46).

As to claims 50, 52, 54, Gao teaches one or more search selection criteria comprises an age of the examined electronic records search request (col. 9, lines 31-46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 3-4, 15-16, 27-28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gao et al. (US Patent No. 6,490,579 B1), in view of Wolfe et al. (US Patent No. 6,263,351 B1).

As to claims 3, 15, 27, Gao does not explicitly teach "the raw data sets comprise court case items or documents associated with a court case docket sheet". However, Wolfe teaches this limitation at col. 2, lines 17-25, col. 5, lines 54-65.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Gao with the teachings of Wolfe to include

"pairing each said seed element with every other seed element in the input set and creating a first linkage between each pair of elements" because it would provide an efficient procedure for an on-line legal research system which is applicable to research documents that extensively cite or refer to other document.

As to claims 4, 16, 28, Gao does not explicitly teach "the electronic records comprise results of an executed electronic court case records search request, at least one criterion used in formulating the electronic court case records search request and data related to at least one electronic court database associated with the electronic court case records search request". However, Wolfe teaches this limitation at col. 7, line 21 to col. 8, line 38.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Gao with the teachings of Wolfe to include "the electronic records comprise results of an executed electronic court case records search request, at least one criterion used in formulating the electronic court case records search request and data related to at least one electronic court database associated with the electronic court case records search request" because it would provide an efficient procedure for an on-line legal research system which is applicable to research documents that extensively cite or refer to other document.

7. Claims 10, 12, 22, 24, 34, 36, 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gao et al. (US Patent No. 6,490,579 B1), in view of Crim et al. (US Patent No. 5,920,866).

As to claims 10, 22, 34, Gao does not explicitly teach "the plurality of electronic record databases comprises at least one first electronic court database accessible through the first communication medium and at least one second electronic court database accessible through the second communication medium". However, Crim teaches this limitation at col. 6, lines 39-54, col. 14, lines 22-47, col. 15, lines 19-24.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Gao with the teachings of Crim to include "the plurality of electronic record databases comprises at least one first electronic court database accessible through the first communication medium and at least one second electronic court database accessible through the second communication medium" because it would allow users to organize, maintain and store vast amounts of data in a form which could be easily recalled and updated.

As to claims 12, 24, 36, Gao does not explicitly teach "the electronic records search requests comprise court case docket sheet search requests". However, Crim teaches this limitation at col. 5, line 52 to col. 6, line 26, Fig. 3.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Gao with the teachings of Crim to include "the electronic records search requests comprise court case docket sheet search requests"

because it would allow users to organize, maintain and store vast amounts of data in a form which could be easily recalled and updated.

As to claims 46, 47, 48, Gao does not explicitly teach "retrieving one or more hard-copy documents associated with a selected user-selectable object". However, Crim teaches this limitation at col. 6, lines 1-26.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Gao with the teachings of Crim to include "retrieving one or more hard-copy documents associated with a selected user-selectable object" because it would allow users to organize, maintain and store vast amounts of data in a form which could be easily recalled and updated.

8. Claims 11, 23, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gao et al. (US Patent No. 6,490,579 B1), in view of Subramaniam et al. (US Patent No. 5,859,972).

As to claims 11, 23, 35, Gao teaches "the second communication medium comprises an Internet connection" at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 3, but Gao does not expressly teach "the first communication medium comprises a telephone dial-up modem connection". However, Subramaniam teaches this limitation at col. 5, line 67 to col. 6, line 3.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Gao with the teachings of Subramaniam to

include "the first communication medium comprises a telephone dial-up modem connection" in order to allow databases to be accessed through both the Internet and the telephone line so that the databases can be located remotely.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 38, 40, 42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments regarding Wolfe disclose "a user is monitored to determine if a list of citations is requested, however the citations that are displayed are not each input by the user requesting a search", with respect to claims 1-13, 25, 49, 51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-4112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Miranda Le
April 04, 2005